

What will you have, DP or NP?

Željko Bošković

University of Connecticut

With a few exceptions, it is standardly assumed that languages without overt articles have a null D; i.e. the difference between English (6) and Serbo-Croatian (7) is assumed to be strictly PF-based, the D being null in SC. I argue that there is a fundamental syntactic difference in the traditional NP (TNP) in English and languages like SC. More precisely, DP is not even present in the TNPs in (7). The conclusion has important ramifications for the semantics of TNP. It argues against the line of research such as Longobardi (1994), which assumes the presence of DP is necessary for argumenthood, and supports a system like Chierchia (1998), where DP is not necessary for argumenthood.

My central argument for the existence of a fundamental difference in the structure of TNP in languages with and those without articles concerns a number of generalizations where the lack of articles in a language plays a crucial role. (I take a language with articles to have an overt counterpart of English *the*, which is furthermore unique (i.e. occurs once per a TNP)). First (1), Corver (1998), Uriagereka (1988), and Bošković (2005) show only languages without articles allow left-branch extractions (LB) like (8). Particularly interesting are Slavic and Romance languages. Slavic languages generally allow LB, with the glaring exception of Bulgarian and Macedonian, the only two Slavic languages that have articles. As for Romance, Latin had no articles and allowed LB, while modern Romance languages have articles and don't allow LB. Second (2), Stjepanović (1998) shows only languages without articles allow adjunct extraction out of TNP (cf. (9), discussed in Chomsky 1986, Culicover&Rochemont 1992, and Huang 1982). Thus, she observes such extraction is allowed in SC and Russian (10), which don't have articles, but disallowed in Bulgarian (11), which has articles. ((9) is good in Spanish. However, Ticio 2003 shows the relevant phrase is actually an argument in Spanish. With clear adjuncts, such extraction is disallowed.) Third, as shown in my earlier work, only languages without articles allow scrambling (3). Thus, scrambling languages SC, Japanese, Korean, Hindi, Latin, Chukchi, Warlpiri, and Turkish all lack articles. (By scrambling I mean here the kind of movement referred to as scrambling in Japanese, not German, whose "scrambling" is a very different operation with very different semantic effects from scrambling in Japanese. One of the defining properties of scrambling for the purpose of (3) is taken to be the existence of long-distance scrambling out of finite clauses, which German doesn't have.) Fourth (4), I show languages without articles disallow negative raising (NR) in examples like (12). This, e.g., holds for SC, Czech, Slovenian, Polish, Russian, Turkish, Korean, Japanese, and Chinese (English, German, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Romanian, and Bulgarian have articles and NR. Note that I consider only NR out of finite clauses. Also, wherever possible, I have relied on the ability of NR to license strict clause-mate NPIs, such as those in (13), rather than the interpretation judgment regarding examples like (12), which is often very subtle.) Fifth, there is a distinction between multiple wh-fronting languages (MWF) regarding whether they show Superiority effects (strict ordering of wh-phrases) in examples like (14). Interestingly, MWF languages without articles (SC, Polish, Czech, Russian, Slovenian) don't show Superiority effects (5). MWF languages that do show them all have articles (Romanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Basque).

Generalizations (1-5) indicate there is a fundamental syntactic difference in the TNP of languages like English and languages like SC. Positing a DP for both and simply assuming the D is null in some SC examples where it is overtly realized in English won't work here since, in contrast to SC, English, e.g., disallows LB, adjunction extraction out of TNP, and scrambling even when D is null. I will implement this syntactic difference by arguing the DP projection is not even present in TNPs of languages like SC. Obviously, these languages lack articles, the prototypical instantiation of D⁰. They do have lexical items like *that*, *some*, and possessives, which are assumed to be located in the DP projection in English. However, these elements behave very differently in these languages. I demonstrate this regarding SC, where they behave like adjectives. First, they are adjectives morphologically (15). Second, in contrast to English, they occur in adjectival positions (16). Third, they can stack up like adjectives, again in contrast to English (17). Fourth, they have some freedom of word order. While in English DP elements always precede adjectives, SC allows adjectives to precede some elements that would be considered to be DP-elements in English (18). Given these facts I argue the elements in question are adjectives, not Ds, in SC. I also show (1-5) receive an explanation under the DP/NP analysis (I am unaware of any explanations of these generalizations under the universal DP analysis). (1)-(3) have already received accounts in terms of the DP/NP analysis (see Bošković 2005 for (1-2) and Bošković 2004 for (3)). Here I provide explanations for (4)-(5). The account of (4) is based on Bošković's (2002) claim that MWF languages that show Superiority effects have true wh-movement, while MWF languages that don't show them don't have true wh-movement. Rather, they move their wh-phrases to a lower projection. I argue the D feature is crucially involved in movement to SpecCP (an assumption that is deduced from the often assumed DP/CP parallelism). The lack of DP is then shown to prevent NP MWF languages from having true wh-movement. Since, as Bošković (2002) shows, superiority effects arise only with MWF to SpecCP (not with MWF to a lower position), it follows NP MWF languages do not show Superiority effects. I also offer a DP/NP account of (4) based on Gajewski (2005), who presents a unified

account of definite plurals and NR predicates on which the latter have the semantic structure of definite plurals.

Examples

((1-5) could turn out to be strong tendencies, which would still call for an explanation. Notice that (1)-(3) are one-way correlations, where the lack of articles is a prerequisite, but not necessarily the only requirement, for the operations in question.)

(1) Only languages without articles allow left-branch extractions like (8).

(2) Only languages without articles allow adjunct extraction out of the traditional NP.

(3) Only languages without articles allow scrambling.

(4) Negative raising is disallowed in languages without articles.

(5) Multiple wh-fronting languages without articles do not display superiority effects in constructions like (14).

(6) The stone broke the window.

(7) Kamen je razbio prozor.

stone is broken window

(Serbo-Croatian, SC)

(8) a. *Expensive_i he likes [_{t_i} cars].

b. Skupa_i voli [_{t_i} kola].
expensive likes cars

(SC)

(9) a. Peter met [_{NP} girls from this city]? b. *From which city_i did Peter meet [_{NP} girls t_i]?

(10) a. Iz kojeg grada_i je Petar sreo [djevojke t_i]

from which city is Peter met girls

(SC)

b. Iz kakogo goroda_i ty vstrechal [devushek t_i]?

from which city you met girls

(Russian)

(11) *Ot koj grad_i Petko [sreštna momičeta t_i]?

from which city Petko met girls

(Bulgarian)

(12) John does not believe that Mary is smart.

(13) a. John didn't believe [that Mary would leave [_{NPI} until tomorrow]]

b. John doesn't believe [that Mary has visited her [_{NPI} in at least two years]]

(14) a. Koj kogo vižda?

b. *Kogo koj vižda?

who whom sees

'Who sees whom?'

(Bulgarian)

c. Ko koga vidi?

d. Koga ko vidi?

who whom sees

(SC)

(15) a. nekim mladim djevojkama
some.fem.pl.instr young.fem.pl.instr girls.fem.pl.instr.

b. nekih mladih djevojaka
fem.gen.pl.

(16) Ova knjiga je moja

*this book is my

(17) ta moja slika

*this my picture

(18) Jovanova skupa slika vs. skupa Jovanova slika

John's expensive picture *expensive John's picture

References

Bošković, Ž. 2002. On multiple wh-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 351-383.

Bošković, Ž. 2004. Topicalization, focalization, lexical insertion, and scrambling. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:613-638.

Bošković, Ž. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59: 1-45.

Chierchia, G. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 339-405.

Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Corver, N. 1992. Left branch extraction. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 22, 67-84.

Culicover, P., and M. Rochemont. 1992. Adjunct extraction from NP and the ECP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 496-501.

Gajewski, Jon. 2005. *Neg-raising: Polarity and presupposition*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Huang, C. -T. J. 1982. *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Longobardi, G. 1994. Reference and proper names. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 609-665.

Stjepanović, S. 1998. Extraction of adjuncts out of NPs. Presented at the IU Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop

Ticio, E. 2003. *On the structure of DPs*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Uriagereka, J. 1988. *On government*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.